

6

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case:2:19-cr-20474
Judge: Tarnow, Arthur J.
MJ: Stafford, Elizabeth A.
Filed: 07-16-2019 At 03:05 PM
INFO USA V. HUDSON (DA)

DAVID HUDSON

Vio: 18 U.S.C. § 1343

Defendant.

I N F O R M A T I O N

The United States Attorney Charges:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

1. Between approximately 2008 and 2017, in the Eastern District of Michigan and elsewhere, defendant DAVID HUDSON engaged in a scheme to defraud his employers Cummins Bridgeway, LLC (“CBL”) and Cummins Inc. (“Cummins”).

2. HUDSON worked for CBL from approximately 2003 through 2014, until it was acquired by Cummins. Post-acquisition, HUDSON was employed by Cummins.

3. Prior to 2008, the owners of CBL established two entities to which CBL profits were paid for the purpose of sharing profits with CBL management and employees, Equibridge, LLC and Bridgeway Associates, LLC (the “Profit Sharing Entities”).

4. HUDSON had authority to write checks from the Profit Sharing Entities.

5. While working at CBL, HUDSON’s job involved transferring funds to the Profit Sharing Entities in the normal course of business.

6. It was part of the scheme to defraud that HUDSON would, under false pretenses, direct an employee under his supervision to transfer CBL funds—and later Cummins funds—into one or more of the Profit Sharing Entities.

7. It was part of the scheme to defraud that HUDSON would then, without authorization, write checks from the Profit Sharing Entities to himself.

8. It was the goal of this scheme that HUDSON would take advantage of his authority and position in order to enrich himself at the expense of his employers.

9. Between the years of approximately 2008 and 2017, HUDSON’s scheme resulted in the fraudulent transfer of over \$4.5 million dollars.

COUNT ONE

**18 U.S.C. § 1343
Wire Fraud**

10. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 9 are incorporated herein.

11. Between 2008 and 2017, said time period being approximate, in the Eastern District of Michigan and elsewhere, defendant DAVID HUDSON, having devised a scheme to defraud, and to obtain money by means of false and fraudulent pretenses and representations, did cause certain signs, signals and sounds (“wires”) to be transmitted in interstate commerce for the purpose of executing the scheme to defraud.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343.

FORFEITURE ALLEGATIONS

**18 U.S.C. § 981 and 28 U.S.C. § 2461
Criminal Forfeiture**

12. Upon being convicted of violating Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343 as alleged in this Information, defendant shall forfeit to the United States any property which constitutes, or is derived from, proceeds obtained directly or indirectly as a result of such violation, pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 981(a)(1)(C) and Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461.

13. Substitute Assets: If the property described above as being subject to forfeiture, as a result of any act or omission of defendant:

- (a) Cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence;
- (b) Has been transferred or sold to, or deposited with, a third party;
- (c) Has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the Court;
- (d) Has been substantially diminished in value; or
- (e) Has been commingled with other property that cannot be subdivided without difficulty;

14. It is the intent of the United States, pursuant to Title 21, United States Code, Section 853(p) as incorporated by Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461, to seek to forfeit any other property of defendant up to the value of the forfeitable property described above.

15. Money Judgment: Upon being convicted of violating Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343 as alleged in this Information, defendant shall forfeit to the United States a sum of money equal to the amount representing the total amount of proceeds obtained as a result of his violation, pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32.2, Title 18, United States Code, Section 981(a)(1)(C) and Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW SCHNEIDER
United States Attorney

s/ John K. Neal
John K. Neal
Chief, White-Collar Crimes Unit

s/ Timothy J. Wyse
Timothy J. Wyse
Assistant United States Attorney
211 West Fort Street, Suite 2001
Detroit, MI 48226
Tel: (313) 226-9144
Email: Timothy.Wyse@usdoj.gov


Dated: July 16, 2019

United States District Court
Eastern District of Michigan

Criminal Case Cov

Case:2:19-cr-20474
Judge: Tarnow, Arthur J.
MJ: Stafford, Elizabeth A.
Filed: 07-16-2019 At 03:05 PM
INFO USA V. HUDSON (DA)

NOTE: It is the responsibility of the Assistant U.S. Attorney signing this form to comp

Companion Case Information	Companion Case Number:
This may be a companion case based upon LCrR 57.10 (b)(4) ¹ :	Judge Assigned:
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	AUSA's Initials: 

Case Title: USA v. David Hudson

County where offense occurred : Wayne

Check One: ☒ **Felony** ☐ **Misdemeanor** ☐ **Petty**

☐ Indictment/ ☒ Information --- no prior complaint.
☐ Indictment/ ☐ Information --- based upon prior complaint [Case number: _____]
☐ Indictment/ ☐ Information --- based upon LCrR 57.10 (d) [Complete Superseding section below].

Superseding Case Information

Superseding to Case No: _____ **Judge:** _____

- ☐ Corrects errors; no additional charges or defendants.
☐ Involves, for plea purposes, different charges or adds counts.
☐ Embraces same subject matter but adds the additional defendants or charges below:

Defendant name


Charges

Prior Complaint (if applicable)

Please take notice that the below listed Assistant United States Attorney is the attorney of record for the above captioned case.

July 16, 2019

Date


 Timothy J. Wyse
 Assistant United States Attorney
 211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2001
 Detroit, MI 48226-3277
 Phone: 313-226-9144
 Fax: 313-226-2873
 E-Mail address: Timothy.Wyse@usdoj.gov
 Attorney Bar #:

¹ Companion cases are matters in which it appears that (1) substantially similar evidence will be offered at trial, or (2) the same or related parties are present, and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence. Cases may be companion cases even though one of them may have already been terminated.